

Accreditation Study Work Group
Topics, Options, and Implications Matrix

Topics	Options Considered to Date	Policy Implications	Budget/Cost Implications	Impact to the Profession	Change Req	Work Group Recommendations
Purpose of Accreditation	Continue purposes as defined in <i>Accreditation Framework</i>	Framework language not currently in sync with the Education Code and generally accepted purposes for accreditation.	CTC: No additional costs Institutions: No additional costs		NC	
	Modify definition of purpose of accreditation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose of accreditation: Assure Quality, Accountability, Foster Program Improvement, Adhere to Standards • Essential Attributes: Description of the attributes of the implementation accreditation system 	Framework language would be revised to better align with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education Code Section 44371 (a) • Purposes of accreditation as generally agreed to by the California education community • Generally accepted purposes for accreditation used by others (other professions, other accrediting bodies, other states, etc.) 	By itself, redefining purpose has no direct cost implications.	Would clarify to the education community, students and prospective teachers, public officials, and members of the general public, the purposes of accreditation.	AF or EC	
Role of CTC and COA	Continue roles as defined in <i>Accreditation Framework</i>	Accreditation policies continue to be established by the Commission. Accreditation decisions continue to be the responsibility of the Committee on Accreditation.	CTC: No additional costs Institutions: No additional costs		NC	

DRAFT – WORK IN PROGRESS

Topics	Options Considered to Date	Policy Implications	Budget/Cost Implications	Impact to the Profession	Change Req	Work Group Recommendations
	<p>Modify the role of the Commission in accreditation</p> <p>a) COA representative reports at all Commission meetings</p> <p>b) COA information or consent item on the agenda at each Commission meeting, or as appropriate</p> <p>c) Commission ratification of accreditation decisions made by COA</p> <p>d) Eliminate COA, Commission makes all accreditation decisions</p> <p>e) COA initially accredits institutions instead of the Commission</p>	<p>a) May foster better Commission oversight of accreditation activities and improved communication about accreditation related matters without changing policy that COA makes accreditation decisions and Commission is responsible for accreditation policies.</p> <p>b) Information item to Commission would have no direct policy implication. May have same advantages as option (a). Consent item to the Commission would require Commission action, which, in essence would transfer accreditation decision to the Commission from the COA and may have the same policy implications as option (c).</p> <p>c) Ratification of COA accreditation decisions by the Commission could be a significant policy change and would, in effect, transfer the decision making authority currently delegated in the <i>Framework</i> to the COA.</p> <p>d) Is a major policy change. Would transfer all decision making authority to the Commission. The Commission would have to assume the responsibilities of the COA to receive accreditation reports, hear review team analysis, to deliberate and to reach accreditation decisions. Raises questions about the existence of an appellate body for Commission decisions since the commission is the current appellate body for COA accreditation decisions.</p> <p>e) Would transfer responsibility of initial accreditation to COA from CTC.</p>	<p>a) No additional cost to the IHE. Would require the Commission to assume the cost of COA representative at all Commission meetings – estimated annual cost is \$2,500.</p> <p>b) No additional cost to the IHE. Agenda item could be presented by staff at no additional cost to the Commission. If COA representative were present at all Commission meetings – estimated annual cost is \$2,500.</p> <p>c) By itself, no additional cost to the IHE or CTC. If representation by COA is required at Commission meetings, estimated annual cost is same as above.</p> <p>d) Initial savings of approximately \$20,000 in annual COA meeting costs. But this savings would likely be transferred to additional meeting time needed by the Commission to discuss accreditation matters. As a result, much of this savings is unlikely to materialize.</p> <p>e) Budget implications would depend on additional meeting time necessary to address initial program approvals.</p>		AF or EC	

DRAFT – WORK IN PROGRESS

Topics	Options Considered to Date	Policy Implications	Budget/Cost Implications	Impact to the Profession	Change Req	Work Group Recommendations
National Accreditation	Continue national accreditation options as defined in Ed Code and <i>Accreditation Framework</i> , no change required		CTC: No additional costs Institutions: No additional costs		NC	
	Replace California’s accreditation process with national accreditation	Could lose the focus on California’s K-12 Standards and issues specific to California	CTC: Institutions:	Lose the focus on diversity and California schools, K-12 standards, and CTC adopted standards	AF	
	Eliminate national accreditation options		CTC: No change Institutions: Increase IF separate national process,	Restricts institutions from national accreditation in a cohesive manner with state process	EC	
	Modify existing practice.					
Multiple Subject-Subject Matter Programs	Continue current initial program approval process and no further program review	No on-going assurance of compliance or quality. No knowledge if program changes	CTC: No additional costs Institutions: No additional costs		NC	
	Collect ongoing data from programs in lieu of a site visit	Allows CTC to collect program information	CTC: Institutions:		AF	
	Include subject matter programs in the accreditation system in a modified manner.		CTC: Institutions:		AF	
	Include subject matter programs in the accreditation system.		CTC: Institutions:		AF	

DRAFT – WORK IN PROGRESS

Single Subject— Subject Matter Programs	Continue current initial program approval process and no further program review	No ongoing assurance of compliance or quality No knowledge if program changes	CTC: No additional costs Institutions: No additional costs		NC	
	Collect ongoing data from programs in lieu of a site visit	Allows CTC to collect program information	CTC: Institutions:		AF	
	Include subject matter programs in the accreditation system in a modified manner.		CTC: Institutions:		AF	
	Include subject matter programs in the accreditation system		CTC: Institutions:		AF	
Blended Programs	Continue current initial program approval process and no further program review	No ongoing assurance of compliance or quality No knowledge if program changes	CTC: No additional costs Institutions: No additional costs		NC	
	Include Blended programs in the accreditation system in a modified manner.		CTC: Institutions:		AF	
5 th Year Programs	Continue current initial program approval process with no further review	No ongoing assurance of compliance or quality	CTC: No additional costs Institutions: No additional costs		NC	
	Include 5 th year programs in the accreditation system in a modified manner		CTC: Institutions:		AF	
	Include 5 th year programs in the accreditation system as other programs		CTC: Institutions:		AF	

DRAFT – WORK IN PROGRESS

Induction Programs	Continue current initial program approval process and ongoing review with Formal Program Review with oversight by the BTSA Task Force		CTC: No additional costs Institutions: No additional costs		NC	
	Include Induction Programs in the accreditation system as other programs		CTC: Institutions:		AF	
	Include Induction Programs in the accreditation system, BTSA Task Force coordinates the process, and the COA accredits the programs		CTC: Institutions:		AF	
Data Collection	Yet to be addressed		CTC: Institutions:		AF	
Interim-Peer Review Activities	A standards based peer review process on an annual or bi-annual process. This process could be focused on the unit or the programs		CTC: Institutions:		AF	
	No interim review activity		CTC: No additional costs Institutions: No additional costs		NC	
Unit Accreditation or Program Approval	Continue to accredit the institution with program approval embedded in the single accreditation process.	Unit accreditation allows leverage to work across the IHE	CTC: No additional costs Institutions: No additional costs		NC	
	Move back to a program approval system without any institution wide accreditation decision	1.No leverage to work with programs across the IHE. 2.May allow a more thorough examination of each program	CTC: Institutions:		AF EC	
	Develop a new blended system that addresses both unit accreditation AND individual program approval in a different manner.		CTC: Institutions:		AF EC	
Accreditation Decisions	Yet to be addressed		CTC: Institutions:		EC AF	

DRAFT – WORK IN PROGRESS

2042 Required Elements versus Breadth and Flexibility	Yet to be addressed		CTC: Institutions:			
--	---------------------	--	-----------------------	--	--	--